

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-12 are currently pending. Claims 10-12 are hereby added. Claims 5 and 7-9 were withdrawn as directed to a non-elected species without prejudice or surrender of subject matter. Claim 1 is independent. Claims 1-9 are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

II. EXAMINER INTERVIEW - RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Applicant thanks the Examiner for granting the telephone interview on October 29, 2007. Applicant requested claim 7, previously withdrawn as directed to a non-elected species, be reinstated because that claim actually is directed to the elected species.

In response to the restriction requirement mailed May 5, 2007, Applicant elected Species 1 (FIGS. 1-6), claims 1-6 for further prosecution in the present application.

In the instant Office Action the Examiner ascertained claim 5 also reads on the non-elected Species 2 and withdrew that claim from consideration.

Applicant has ascertained claim 7 is actually directed to Species 1, **not** Species 2 and should be re-instated and considered by the Examiner. In Species 1 (FIGS. 1-6), the mounting parts are 9a, 9b and are joined by bringing those parts together in a direction parallel to the drum 4. In Species 2 (FIGS. 7-15), the mounting parts are 41a, 41b are joined by bringing those parts together in a direction perpendicular to the drum 42. In claim 7, the mounting parts are joined by bringing those parts together in a direction parallel to the drum and, therefore, claim 7 rightly is directed to Species 1.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reinstatement of claim 7 as reading on Species 1. That is, Species 1 (FIGS. 1-6) reads on claims 1-4, 6 and 7 and those claims should be examined in the present application.

III. OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The specification has been amended as shown herein above to overcome the objections in the Office Action. The specification also has been amended as shown herein above to correct typographical errors.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-4 and 6 were rejected as allegedly indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 has been re-written as new claim 10. The remaining claims, including the withdrawn claims, have been amended to clarify the recitation of the elements and structure of the invention.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection of the claims.

V. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,352,349 to Hennequin.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 10 recites, *inter alia*:

“... said first mounting part and said second mounting part shaped to provide a through hole when assembled

...

at least one cord passing through the through hole

...

wherein the first mounting part and the second mounting part each support the winding drum.

Thus, in an aspect of the present invention as recited in claim 10, there are two mounting parts. The two mounting parts are shaped such that, when assembled together, a through hole is formed. A cord of the blind is passed through the through hole formed by the assembly of the first mounting part to the second mounting part. Put another way, the cord of the present device passes through a through hole formed by the two mounting parts when the mounting parts are assembled together. Moreover, the first and second mounting parts each also function to support the winding drum.

The Office Action asserts Hannequin describes, in relevant part, a Venetian blind having an operating shaft 2 (allegedly corresponding to Applicant's winding drum) supported by upper part 3, lower part 4, partition 11 and end wall 12 (allegedly corresponding to Applicant's first mounting part and second mounting part).

However, to read on claim 10, when the supporting parts of Hannequin are assembled together, a through hole must be formed. In addition, the through hole formed must be used for a cord to pass through. However, the alleged supporting parts of Hannequin (*i.e.*, 3, 4, 11 and 12) do not have a shape such that, when the parts are assembled together, form a through hole through which pass one of Hannequin's cords (13, 14). Put another way, the cords of Hannequin do not pass through a through hole that is formed by the assembly of the supporting parts to one another.

In addition, Hannequin's partition 11 forming a hole for passage of a cord does not also support the operating shaft 2.

Hence, claim 10 is not anticipated by Hannequin because that reference does not disclose each and every element recited in the claim.

VI. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from claim 10 as discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-4, 6 and 10-12 are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Ronald R. Santucci
Reg. No. 28,988
(212) 588-0800